



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/716,018	11/17/2000	Robert Huber	00 P 7777 US 01	6535

7590 11/14/2003

Elsa Keller, Legal Assistant
Siemens Corporation
Intellectual Property Department
186 Wood Avenue South
Iselin, NJ 08830

EXAMINER

KASENGE, CHARLES R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2125

DATE MAILED: 11/14/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/716,018

Applicant(s)

HUBER, ROBERT

Examiner

Charles R Kasenge

Art Unit

2125

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11, 13-18, and 20-30 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-4, 11, 13-18, and 20-30 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments, see "Amendment and Response to Final Office Action", filed October 15, 2003, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 1-4, 11, 13-18, and 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. 103(a) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Pasadyn et al. U.S. Patent 6,442,496.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

3. The changes made to 35 U.S.C. 102(e) by the American Inventors Protection Act of 1999 (AIPA) and the Intellectual Property and High Technology Technical Amendments Act of 2002 do not apply when the reference is a U.S. patent resulting directly or indirectly from an international application filed before November 29, 2000. Therefore, the prior art date of the reference is determined under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) prior to the amendment by the AIPA (pre-AIPA 35 U.S.C. 102(e)).

4. Claims 1-4, 11, 13, 14, 18, 26, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Pasadyn et al. U.S. Patent 6,442,496. Referring to claim 1, 18, and 26, Pasadyn

Art Unit: 2125

discloses a system for managing electronics manufacturing data (col. 8 and 9, lines 57-67 and 1-4) comprising: a processor (col. 2, lines 50-65); a data storage device operably connected to the processor (col. 7, lines 14-27), the data storage device storing manufacturing standardization data and a plurality of electronic manufacturing data sets, each of the plurality of electronic manufacturing data sets corresponding to a local manufacturing process (col. 7, lines 14-42); and a difference editor executable on the processor to display differences between at least one of the electronic manufacturing data sets and the manufacturing standardization data (col. 7, lines 14-61). Referring to claim 2, the data storage device includes a server for providing the manufacturing standardization data (Fig. 1). The Office interprets the computer system to be a processor and server for storing manufacturing data.

Referring to claim 3, Pasadyn discloses the system as recited in claim 2 wherein the data storage device further includes a control system for providing a first of the plurality of electronic manufacturing data sets, the processor being located at the control system (col. 5, lines 20-31).

Referring to claim 4, the data storage device includes a central server for providing the manufacturing standardization data (Fig. 1), a first control system for providing a first of the plurality of electronic manufacturing data sets (Fig. 2, #230 and col. 5, lines 54-65), and a second control system for providing a second of the plurality of electronic manufacturing data sets (Fig. 2, #220 and col. 5, lines 54-65).

Referring to claim 11, Pasadyn discloses a method for managing of electronics manufacturing data, in which the data comprises non-local data and local data (Fig. 2, col. 5, lines 54-65), comprising the steps of: permitting non-local electronics manufacturing data to be modified by a first set of persons (col. 5, lines 32-53); permitting local electronics manufacturing

Art Unit: 2125

data to be modified by a second set of persons (col. 5, lines 32-53); and permitting a comparison between local electronics manufacturing data and non-local electronics manufacturing data wherein the first and second sets of persons are not identical (col. 5 and 6, lines 66-67 and 1-7). Referring to claims 13, 14, and 27, the method as recited in claim 11 wherein the displaying step includes displaying a graphical representation of an electronic component and highlighting the differences (col. 7, lines 14-42 and Figs. 1-2). The Office interprets the computer system with the monitor shown in Figs. 1 and 2 as displaying all manufacturing data including graphically displaying differences between data.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 15-17, 20-25, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pasadyn et al. as applied to claims 1-5, 11, 13, 14, 18, 26, and 27 above, and further in view of Cullen et al. U.S. Patent 5,805,572. Although Pasadyn discloses displaying manufacturing data differences, Pasadyn does not expressly disclose displaying lead information of an electronic component. Cullen discloses using lead information for inspecting and placing lead devices (col. 6, lines 27-32). Cullen also discloses a manufacturing system and method being applied to printed circuit board assembly lines (col. 1, lines 9-18). The manufacturing

Art Unit: 2125

system uses a controller controlled by manufacturing data (col. 8, lines 41-44) and a placement machine for placing components on a printed circuit board (col. 1, lines 9-18).

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to monitor and display lead information for Pasadyn's semiconductor production line monitoring method and apparatus invention. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to do this since Cullen discloses lead information for device placement and inspecting circuit boards as being vital for quality control and increasing manufacturing efficiency (col. 1, lines 38-61). It would have been obvious to apply Pasadyn's invention to printed circuit boards since it is commonly known that semiconductor manufacturing is part of the circuit board manufacturing process.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Charles R Kasenge whose telephone number is 703 305-8592. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday, 8:30 - 5 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Leo Picard can be reached on 703 308-0538. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 746-7239.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 308-0538.

CK
November 10, 2003

Application/Control Number: 09/716,018

Page 6

Art Unit: 2125

L. P. Picard

LEO PICARD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100